



IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States
October Term, 1972

NO. 72-887

AMERICAN PARTY OF TEXAS, *et al.*,
Appellants

v.
BOB BULLOCK, Appellee

NO. 72-942

ROBERT HAINSWORTH, *Appellant*
v.
**BOB BULLOCK, SECRETARY OF STATE
OF TEXAS, Appellee**

On Appeal From The United States District Court
For The Western District of Texas

**BRIEF OPPOSING MOTION TO DISMISS
OR AFFIRM**

ROBERT W. HAINSWORTH
Counsel For Appellant
Alvin Building
3710 Holman Avenue
Houston, Texas 77004



IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States
October Term, 1972

NO. 72-887

RAZA UNIDA PARTY, et al., Appellants

v.

**BOB BULLOCK, SECRETARY OF STATE
OF TEXAS, Appellee**

AMERICAN PARTY OF TEXAS, et al., Appellants

v.

BOB BULLOCK, Appellee

LAUREL DUNN, et al., Appellants

v.

BOB BULLOCK, et al., Appellees

**TEXAS NEW PARTY, TEXAS SOCIALIST
WORKERS PARTY, et al., Appellants**

v.

PRESTON SMITH, et al., Appellees

AND

NO. 72-942

ROBERT HAINSWORTH, Appellant

v.

**BOB BULLOCK, SECRETARY OF STATE
OF TEXAS, Appellee**

**On Appeal From The United States District Court
For The Western District of Texas**

**BRIEF OPPOSING MOTION TO DISMISS
OR AFFIRM**

To The Honorable Supreme Court:

Appellant herein respectfully shows to the Court the following, as additional reasons why the appeal in this case should not be dismissed, nor the judgment sought to be reviewed, affirmed.

STATEMENT

In the Questions Presented, on pages 3 and 4 of Appellees' Motion to Dismiss or Affirm, the principal or only question presented of the 8 Questions set out by Appellees that applies to Case No. 72-942, Hainsworth v. Bullock, Secretary of State, is Question 7, on Page 4, namely:

"7. Are the requirements of Article 13.50 as applied to Appellants so burdensome as to be constitutionally impermissible?"

And in the argument of Appellees in Motion to Dismiss or Affirm, under Question No. 7 (Restated), on page 11, there is this quote:

"The Court stated in its Memorandum Opinion (Appendix A, Appellants' Jurisdictional Statement) that:

"We reject outright Plaintiffs' argument that states can impose no additional election requirements other than those found in the United States Constitution."

Appellants presented no factual basis in support of their general allegation that the provisions of Article 13.50 are "unduly burdensome" as to them. They admitted in oral arguments that they made no attempt to comply with the provisions of Article 13.50."

ARGUMENT

The above quotes do not pertain to the case of Hainsworth v. Bullock, for such appellant did not make the argument that states can impose no additional election requirements other than those found in the United States Constitution.

And also, the said appellant, made a strong effort to comply with the provisions of Art. 13.50. (Tr. Pages 53 to 56), and (Tr. Page 105).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, together with those reasons already set forth in the Jurisdictional Statement of Appellant in Hainsworth v. Bullock, it is respectfully submitted that a substantial question is presented by this appeal for the decision of the Supreme Court, and that review should be granted, with briefs on the merits and oral argument, for resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT W. HAINSWORTH
Counsel For Appellant
Alvin Building
3710 Holman Avenue
Houston, Texas 77004